DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 316 HE 016 842

AUTHOR Leinwand, Gerald
TITLE Without a Nickel: The Challenge of Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus. AASCU Studies 1983/2.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-88044-073-2
PUB DATE Nov 83
NOTE 61p.; Summary of a National Workshop of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (Washington, DC, March 16-18, 1983).
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Educational Policy; Financial Support; *Foreign Students; Fund Raising; Higher Education; *International Education; International Educational Exchange; *Professional Education; *Student Exchange Programs; *Teacher Exchange Programs; *Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

Issues pertaining to internationalizing the undergraduate and professional school curriculum and campus are summarized by the president emeritus of Western Oregon State College, based on a 1983 national workshop attended by college administrators and staff of international programs. Efforts by professional schools to provide international studies and campus activities were addressed, as were the roles of student and faculty exchanges. Attention was also focused on the following concerns: the ways that undergraduate and professional schools can better serve international students, approaches to effectively develop international faculty exchanges, and fund- raising. Challenges that this mission poses for schools that are members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities are addressed, including the development of policies for international education and internationalizing the academic program. Appendices include a workshop schedule and a list of the names and addresses of contact persons (panelists, moderators, federal resource persons) for each of the following sessions: internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum, internationalizing the professional school, integrating educational exchange with the institutional mission, and mobilizing the needed resources. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SCUPIES

aascu

ED238316

1983/2

Without a Nickel

The Challenge of Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

LE016 .A42

American Association of
State Colleges and Universities

WITHOUT A NICKEL:
The Challenge of Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus

Gerald Leinwand
President Emeritus
Western Oregon State College

AASCU STUDIES 1983/2

November 1983

Allan W. Ostar
President

© 1983 by American Association of State Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publications Data

Leinwand, Gerald.
Without a nickel.

(AASCU studies; 1983/2)
1. International education–United States–Congresses. 2. State universities and colleges–United States–Curricula–Congresses. I. Title. II. Series.
LB2329.5.A43 1983/2 [LC1090] 375'.0082 83-16515
ISBN 0-88044-073-2

The opinions and recommendations in this book are those of the author and are not intended to represent the official policy of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

FOREWORD

The happy combination of a national workshop on a subject of high salience with the choice of a perceptive college president as *rapporteur* has yielded a splendid interpretive monograph that is both readable and instructive.

More than one hundred educators–college and university presidents, provosts, deans, directors of international programs, foreign student advisors, language professors, and others–gathered in Washington in mid-March 1983, to concentrate on the theme of Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus, a matter of vital importance in a world that has daily become more interrelated, more interdependent–and more dangerous.

Organized by the Office of International Programs of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, with guidance from its Committee on International Programs, the workshop generated excitement and commitment and fostered a productive interchange. Participants returned home with renewed commitments and an enlarged armamentarium for making good on them. Many conferences end there, with consequences more or less limited to the home campuses of participants.

However, Maurice Harari, AASCU vice president for International Programs, seeking to enlarge the effective reach of the workshop, had invited a former member of AASCU's Committee on International Programs, Gerald Leinwand, to prepare an interpretive monograph on the conference which could be published for member institutions and others. This is that monograph.

Recently president of Western Oregon State College, Dr. Leinwand has successfully disengaged the main themes of the workshop, without losing the special insights and unique details that give them texture and utility. With his clear organization and accurate summaries, Leinwand has skillfully fulfilled the role of *rapporteur*, thereby helping those who could not attend share in the fruits of the workshop. And in its thoroughness and readability, as well as its evidence of good editorial judgment, the monograph stands on its own as a guide and aid to those whose professional duties and citizens' concerns make them activists in international education.

However modest the role of the AASCU Committee on International Programs may have been in abetting the workshop, its members are pleased with this summary and interpretation that can well serve those institutions who need to prepare their students for the interdependent world of now and tomorrow.

James M. Clark
Chairman, AASCU Committee
on International Programs

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Gerald Leinwand was educated in the public schools of New York City and received his B.A., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees from New York University and an M.A. degree from Columbia University. His fields of interest include history and the social sciences. Dr. Leinwand has taught in every grade from grade eight through graduate school. He has been Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Dean at the City College of the City University of New York. He became Professor and Department Chairman at Baruch College of the City University of New York where he assumed additional administrative posts as Acting Dean of the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Associate Provost and Founding Dean of the School of Education. Between 1977 and 1982 Dr. Leinwand was President of Western Oregon State College.

In addition to numerous professional and scholarly articles he has written *The Pageant of World History*, *The Pageant of American History*, both published by Allyn and Bacon. He has also written a tutor-text on *The American Constitution* published by Doubleday. He has written *Teaching History and the Social Sciences* (with Dan Feins) published by Pitman. Dr. Leinwand has written and edited a series of 22 paperback books for Simon and Schuster on *Problems of American Society*.

Dr. Leinwand is president emeritus of Western Oregon State College and senior consultant for AASCU.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD v

ABOUT THE AUTHOR vi

INTRODUCTION 1

WITHOUT A NICKEL: The Challenge of Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus 3

The Nature of the Challenge 6

AASCU and the Challenge 6

Defining the Challenge 10

Where to Start? 14

Establishing Policies for International Education 17

Internationalizing the Academic Program 20

The International Student 27

Faculty Exchanges 34

Mobilizing Needed Resources 39

Meeting the Challenge 42

NOTES 45

APPENDIX A—Workshop Program 47

APPENDIX B—Contact Persons 53

INTRODUCTION

Whether universities are regarded as agencies for the preservation and transmission of cultural heritage or as institutions primarily interested in the teaching of skills and dissemination of new ideas in an increasingly complex and interdependent world, it is clear that they cannot be true to their mission unless they are truly universal in academic content as well as in outlook.

There is disturbing evidence that the United States is becoming increasingly monolingual and somewhat more parochial at a time in its history when the need for foreign languages and intercultural sensitivity is more acute than ever. From an international trade and business point of view, the United States is severely handicapped by the shortage of individuals who can negotiate without interpreters or who can at least reflect a good dose of sensitivity to the cultures involved. There are a number of humorous stories about the fumbling, bungling U.S. businessman overseas, but there is also the tragic side of this coin which tells us that we are losing billions of dollars of business yearly as a result of our linguistic and intercultural inadequacies.

From a professional involvement standpoint, we are also handicapped by the fact that in our international professional dealings, scientific, technical, and diplomatic, many of our representatives, official and private, are not sufficiently well equipped linguistically and interculturally. On a variety of grounds, ranging all the way from a sound exposure to knowledge, in its full universal and cultural context, to the promotion of business or considerations of national security, it is critical that every American be given a chance to acquire a reasonable degree of "global literacy." To achieve this, the role of U.S. higher education and the public schools is critical.

In an effort to assist its colleges and universities to internationalize, AASCU held a national workshop in Washington, D.C. on March 16-18, 1983, on the theme of "Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus." The focus was on undergraduate education and the professional schools. It is worth noting in passing that schools of education in AASCU institutions produce about 50 percent of the public school teachers in the United States. The emphasis was on "how" to internationalize despite severe limitations on financial assistance.

The need to develop a clear view, through consensus building, of the international mission of the institution and to translate this commitment into the organization, curriculum and the international activities of the campus was underscored. A number of efforts in professional schools were

selected for study as were the roles of student and faculty exchanges. The role of the faculty and the leadership of the institution as well as the able orchestration of resources were considered critical. It was also clear, however, thanks to the experience of many and the presence at the workshop of several donor agencies, that external funding was more frequently forthcoming for institutions which had given serious consideration to the development of their international mission and commitment.

AASCU is grateful that Dr. Gerald Leinwand agreed to and so ably captured, in an interpretative essay, the highlights of the workshop. His essay is true to the tone and the sharing of successes, failures, and concerns of the conferees. It also conveys, in low-key fashion, the relentless commitment and dedication of the workshop participants to the imperatives and practicalities of international education.

In organizing the workshop with my able AASCU colleagues and others, I had the pleasure of talking to all the plenary speakers, panelists, and eventually to practically all those who participated in the workshop. Its success is really attributable to the remarkable involvement of all the workshop conferees. AASCU would be remiss if we did not also acknowledge, with gratitude, their interest and participation.

Maurice Harari
AASCU Vice President for
International Programs

WITHOUT A NICKEL:
The Challenge of Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus

Gerald Leinwand*

Writing in 1932, when the nation was in the depths of a depression and many wondered, as they do today, what the future held in store for the United States, George S. Counts asked: "Dare the school build a new social order?"[1] In what may be described as a utopian vision for a just, humane, and compassionate society, George Counts believed schools to be effective instruments for domestic change and social improvement.

Today, our concern with the internationalization of the curriculum of higher education is nothing less than a restatement of Counts' challenge of just over 50 years ago expressed now in global terms. Through the internationalization of the curriculum and the campus, we seek not only to improve general and professional education, enrich the instructional process, broaden the vision and insights of students and faculty, and enhance the quality of campus life, but also to challenge the nation's colleges and universities to build a new social order on a global scale.

Can colleges and universities change the global social order? Perhaps an insight into some of the difficulties that must be overcome before this goal can be achieved may be gleaned from the following story adapted from a speech by Leland Miles, president of the University of Bridgeport (CT), at a meeting of the Association of American Colleges of January 12, 1982:[2]

> A college president had a dream in which the Archangel Michael appeared with a young woman of 17. The Archangel said, "Mr. President, this young woman is going to be President of the United States in 2020 A.D. and we are looking for a college that would prepare her for that awe-

*Gerald Leinwand is president emeritus of Western Oregon State College and senior consultant for AASCU.

some task. We would like to know, if we entered her at your university, what type of education you would give her so that she could be an intelligent and humane and international world leader?" The college president was speechless, dumbfounded! Nobody, particularly an angel, had ever asked him such a question before. The Archangel, receiving no response, looked the president straight in the eye, took the young woman by the hand and walked away in disgust.

This so embarrassed the president that he began to think of all the types of courses he would offer if he really knew that on his campus he was educating a future President of the United States. He would offer an international core curriculum that would consist of team-taught courses with professors from many disciplines. There would be problem-oriented courses and issue-based courses. There would be cross-cultural courses in religion, ethics, history, anthropology, literature, sociopolitical and economic systems, philosophy, and law. The future president would be introduced to the emergence of nation states, the concepts of nationalism and revolution, to the pros and cons of technology, to notions of progress, to differences between developing and developed nations, to evolution and race prejudice. The future president would be introduced to the historical roots of modern problems and what direction these problems might take in the future. The future president would be taught how to be a leader, a person who could cross ideological boundaries gracefully, who could communicate across national boundaries, who could maintain a humanistic scale of values while at the same time respect sensitively the values of others. The future president would, above all, be taught how to use power for peaceful purposes.

Then a marvelous thing happened, the Archangel Michael came back with the young woman who was to be the future president. "Mr. President," the Archangel said, "I've taken this young woman everywhere and every university president was as dumbfounded as you. So I thought I'd come back and give you a second chance." This time the president said, "Let me tell you something Mike (getting a bit more familiar); I've got an international core curriculum that will knock your wings off." The president then described all that he had planned and the Archangel began to glow,

then to glow all over, since the more he heard the more he liked. "By God, (with apologies, of course) that is exactly what we are looking for. We will send this young woman to your university."

The young woman who had been silent all this time then spoke up. "Mr. President," she asked, "what you say sounds fine, but what makes you think the faculty will approve, the board will support, and the legislature will fund such a curriculum?" Once again, the president was dumbfounded. Once again he was speechless. Once again he stared at the Archangel Michael and the angel stared at him. And, once again, the angel took the young woman by the hand and slowly vanished.

Dare the colleges and universities change the global social order and can they do so? As the story Miles told suggests, the goal will not be easily achieved. The electronic age in which we live recreates the world as a global village, and we are immersed in its tensions, and intrigue. The cast of characters dress in strange costumes and speak in unfamiliar languages. We are constantly bombarded by events whose implications are genuinely disturbing. For example, there are currently 10 conflicts in the Middle East/Persian Gulf, 10 more in Asia and Africa, seven in Latin America, and three in Europe. We witness, via satellite enhanced television, these wars, these rebellions, these violent uprisings. Yet we are but gate crashers to world events if their significance escapes us and if we go about our business unmindful of the importance of what we have seen and heard.

Kenneth Boulding points out that today the world is divided between super-cultures and traditional cultures. The former is the environment of airports, throughways, skyscrapers, hybrid corn and artificial fertilizers, birth control, and universities. The latter is made up of folk customs and practices based on religious, ethnic, and linguistic traditions. Tensions between these two culture systems are very great; and while no society is completely one or the other, nevertheless,

> "if the super-culture simply destroys the traditional culture in which it is embedded, it may easily destroy itself. On the other hand, if the traditional culture does not adapt to the super-culture, it too may destroy itself. This is a precarious balance and not all societies may achieve it. The costs of failure to achieve it, however, are very high and there is a great need, therefore, for widespread self-consciousness about the nature of the problem, and a willingness to put resources into solving it."[3]

The Nature of the Challenge

The challenge inherent in internationalizing the curriculum and the campus is to find ways and means of deepening the understanding of students and faculty of our dependence on other men and women in the global village of planet earth. Today, there is no issue in foreign affairs that does not have domestic implications, and there is scarcely a domestic question that does not have worldwide implications. Because "domestic" and "foreign" have seemingly lost their useful distinctions, international education, Sir Eric Ashby advises, "must cultivate the ability to live with insecurity and adapt to an uncertain future. The fixed expectations of continuity and predictability must now be shaded by the possibility of radical discontinuities and unpredictable situations, many arising precisely from the international arena."[4]

The awareness involved in internationalizing the curriculum and the campus is such that "a person can no longer be considered well-educated who is unaware of the major trends in population growth and natural resource utilization and management, the principal pros and cons of alternative energy sources, the opportunities for and constraints on expanding the world's food supply, the broad issues affecting the harvesting of the oceans and the mining of seabeds, the dynamics of growth as these relate to problems of transnational pollution, the dangers of nuclear proliferation or the radical disparities between the developed and underdeveloped parts of the world."[5]

Henry Kissinger put the issue squarely before us when he said, "The national interest can no longer be devised or attained in isolation from the global interest." "We are," he concluded, "wired together so tightly that a short circuit could fry us all."

AASCU and the Challenge

While AASCU institutions cannot respond to these challenges alone, they can ignore them only at their peril.

What exactly they can do was the theme of the AASCU International Workshop held in Washington, D.C., March 16-18, 1983. (See Appendices A and B for workshop program and list of resource persons.) The participants at that workshop probed many facets of international education, and addressed the following basic questions:

- How can the undergraduate, general education component of the curriculum be internationalized?
- How can the curriculum of the professional schools be internationalized?
- How should institutional infrastructures be modified to give sharpened focus, enhanced visibility, and clear direction to international activities on the campus?
- How can colleges and universities better serve international students and how can international students help enrich the quality of campus life?
- How can international faculty exchanges be effectively developed?
- How can the funds to achieve the objectives of internationalizing the curriculum and the campus be obtained?

As conference participants acknowledged, the interest Americans once expressed in international matters was largely perceived as altruistic. We were, on occasion, concerned with, "How can we help *them*?" While this outlook has by no means completely vanished, today the issue is that we can neither help them nor defend ourselves, nor get the help we need, nor "sell the Coca-Cola we must," (as one participant put it) without a sensitive awareness of our global surroundings.

Although AASCU institutions, which represent nearly 20 percent of the total student enrollment in U.S. higher education, have long been concerned with curriculum and campus reform, meeting the challenge of internationalizing the curriculum and the campus may be especially difficult for many of them. Among the larger institutional problems, the following were identified:

- Many AASCU institutions are often located in areas of the nation that are seemingly remote from where global forces are confronting one another.
- They serve students from a local region who often lack "global readiness" in that their experiences have been limited by the boundaries of the community in which they were born. More often than not, they are the first in their families to attend college and their primary objective is their first job, which is perceived to be of far greater consequence than gaining an insight into the customs, traditions, and values of distant neighbors.
- They are often smaller institutions without the advantages of scale or benefits of a critical mass of students or faculty, which in larger colleges and universities, can, to a degree, ensure some global dimension or international flavor that may be used as a point of departure for a more

sophisticated global awareness. Their administrative structure may make it difficult or perhaps impossible to establish a separate office devoted to international affairs.

- They are often unattractive to foreign students because they sometimes lack program diversity (e.g., engineering, computer science, business administration) and offer a social and community environment that may not be readily hospitable to foreign visitors.
- AASCU institutions are largely undergraduate in nature; and it is at this level that there is greatest difficulty in determining what undergraduate education is all about, much less how to internationalize it. James A. Perkins, the president of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, noted: "There is no coherent feeling or judgment in this country of the mission of undergraduate education in any field."[6] It is therefore not surprising that internationalizing the curriculum remains so difficult and elusive.
- They are often beset with financial problems that are made particularly acute by their dependence for funds on political entities that may seek to limit access to higher education only to those who can contribute extensively to their own education.
- They require, perhaps more than other institutions, a more thorough review of their institutional missions so that the international dimension of the campus and curriculum is addressed without arousing the ire of boards of higher education and of state legislatures, who may regard international education as a frill the state can ill afford and one that is perceived to be inconsistent with the mission of a regional college or university. How to incorporate international education into the curriculum and the campus without jarring the institutional gyroscope is no small task for many AASCU colleges and universities.

Yet, AASCU institutions are not without resources and opportunities in attempts to internationalize. Indeed, they are in a position to assume the leadership and to make a difference with a group of students who might not otherwise have the opportunity of gaining a better understanding of the nature of the world around them. Among the inherent opportunities of AASCU institutions in internationalizing the curriculum and the campus the following are among the more important:

- More than other colleges and universities, AASCU institutions were established largely to provide greater access to higher education for U.S. men and women largely on the assumption–a reasonable and correct one to be sure–that the national interest requires a citizenry

equipped with a sophisticated education that incorporates preparation for making a life as well as making a living. There is no way of cultivating effective citizenship without a globally oriented curriculum. International education is consistent with these goals.

- Even a few foreign students at one of the smaller AASCU campuses can make a difference. It takes just a few students to create the international awareness so essential if civic literacy in today's interrelated and interdependent world is to be achieved.
- While dollars are limited, a minor investment to send faculty abroad, or to enhance the library holdings in the international field, or to make some curriculum modifications can go far in making a difference in the richness and the rigor of the academic environment. Much of what is essential in international education can be incorporated into the curriculum and integrated with the campus "without a nickel" of additional expenditure, as Maurice Harari, AASCU vice president for International Programs, frequently points out.
- If, as has been contended, it takes only 20 or 25 percent of the faculty to join forces in bringing about curricular change and improvement, it takes but a handful of people sitting around a conference table and talking to each other face to face, to generate the enthusiasm and ideas necessary to implement the international dimension of the institution. Often, smaller campuses have the advantage of greater flexibility, a less-rigid administrative structure, and perhaps a less-entrenched faculty.
- In important ways, AASCU institutions can play a leadership role not only in internationalizing the campus but in internationalizing the geographic region of which they are a part. In his remarks, Charles M. Smallwood, dean of the School of Agriculture and Home Economics at the California State University at Fresno, noted that "most AASCU universities are located in geographic regions similar to some . . . developing countries. . . ." As a result, a college or university located in such an area should learn what has been useful in improving the economy of the local region, bring such expertise to the attention of the leaders of developing nations; and, in parallel fashion, bring expertise gathered by working in such countries to the attention of the community itself.
- In AASCU institutions, presidents are rarely remote figures who deal only with a chain of command internally while devoting most of their time and energies to external constituencies. The personal involvement of the presidents who may wish, on a gradual basis, to internationalize the campus and the curriculum can go a long way to impart a significant global flavor to their institutions.

Internationalizing the campus and the curriculum is, at best, no easy task for any institution; failure to do so, however, involves graduating students whose education is fragmented and incomplete. But having said this, precisely what is international education?

Defining the Challenge

An obstacle in the way of internationalizing the curriculum and the campus is the question of definition. George W. Bonham, in his essay "Education and the World View," notes that international education is an "ill-defined concept."[7] A study undertaken by Don Sikkink of St. Cloud State University (MN) on the subject of internationalizing the curriculum of that institution notes the observations of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies that "the nature of the 'field' [international studies] also creates problems. There is no field. Terms such as global education, international studies, cross-cultural studies and area studies mean different things to different people . . . Nor is there a consensus about the parameters of the enterprise. . . ."[8]

Providing an exact definition of international education may be permanently elusive. To some, it means making the studies in humanities more rigorous; to others, it means similar improvement in the social sciences. International education is often synonymous with encouraging the study and teaching of foreign languages. To environmentalists, international education involves a study of global efforts at conservation and resource utilization.

To some, international education means encouraging foreign students to attend U.S. universities by way of providing a more heterogeneous student body. To still others, it means sending U.S. students abroad to become sensitized to the needs of emerging peoples. In some cases, international education means encouraging faculty members to take advantage of existing programs that enable them to travel, study, teach, and do research abroad under such formal arrangements as the Fulbright program. In other cases, it means encouraging faculty from foreign countries to study, teach, and do research in U.S. universities. And in still other situations, it means developing faculty exchanges based upon individual and institutional initiatives.

The problem of definition is compounded further by the fact that area studies, cross-cultural studies, and transnational studies are sometimes presented as amalgamations of disciplines but in and of themselves lack a

research base or original materials upon which to build a course of study that merits rigorous examination and disciplined, consistent, systematic treatment. Moreover, these terms convey marginal—even imperceptible-differences in meaning and serve largely to confuse rather than to enlighten. Area studies, at one time widely heralded as the means by which students would be provided with the international perspective they may otherwise lack, are no longer considered adequate for that purpose since they touch only a very limited number of students on any campus and are not easily diffused within an institution.

It is indeed difficult to analyze or quantify the international ethos of a campus. In a sense it is what a foundation officer attempts to determine before recommending an international grant to an institution. The intangibles might include among other factors the tradition of the institution, the quality of its leadership or the world outlook of a few key faculty members who are respected and provide leadership on campus. It is also true that the positive attitude of the leadership and faculty towards matters international is insufficient unless it is translated into tangible international programs. AASCU's study entitled "Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus"[9] attempts to measure the degree to which AASCU institutions are "internationalized" by providing a profile of some 204 institutions or 77.19 percent of AASCU's membership by measuring the visible activity in the field of international education. The result is a useful survey that demonstrates that 53.87 percent of AASCU's membership are in categories I and II (the least amount of internationalization), while 46.23 percent are in categories III, IV, and V. About twice as many AASCU institutions are in the lowest category (14 percent) as are in the highest category (7.22 percent).

Is it enough to measure how much internationalization exists on a campus by an institution's visible activity in this area? The whole equals the sum of its parts only in geometry. In the less quantifiable disciplines the whole may be more or less than the sum of its parts or equal to them. Thus, an institution which is in the highest AASCU category for international activity may, in fact, not be producing students who are globally minded at all, if this is the assumed goal of international studies. Parochial and provincial concerns may persist among faculty as well as among students, and the books in an otherwise excellent library on international education may gather dust on the shelves. Foreign students on campus may well be isolated from the main body of students, and their effectiveness in making the campus a more cosmopolitan place may be largely dissipated by *de facto* segregation in residential and recreational activities. These comments point out not so much the shortcomings in trying to measure the internationalization of a campus by the quantity of activity that may be found on it, but

indicate that the intangibles of leadership tradition, and faculty commitment also play a key role when properly orchestrated.

"The widest and most neglected frontier of educational reform," declares Harlan Cleveland, "is no longer international studies. It is a global perspective in all studies."[10] "Competent American citizenship in an interdependent world," he continues, "cannot come from stuffing into the schools' curriculum another course or two about foreign areas and faraway cultures. It will come from a generation of students relearning in each course they take, on every subject, at every level of education, that the world is round . . . that everything Americans do or do not do affects the rest of the world, and everything others do bears watching for its effects on our own lives, our own purposes and our own destiny."[11]

A definition of international education cannot be confined to history, foreign languages, and the social sciences. Today, mathematics, physics, and chemistry are international in character. Indeed, the physical and natural sciences may well be the catalyst for stimulating international education in that modern science can best develop as the result of cooperative global effort. If we can look to the hard sciences and mathematics to endorse the concept of international education, other studies may follow and profit from their example.

Internationalization of the curriculum and the campus requires a review of what we teach in U.S. history, in American studies, in American literature, as well as in music and art. Indeed, Mohd Nasir Zain, director of the Malaysian Students Department of the Embassy of Malaysia, held that internationalizing the curriculum and the campus may well also involve the team sports that are encouraged and popular abroad, such as soccer and field hockey. It is not enough to confine global concerns to world history and literature alone, nor to foreign language study. The international environment in which Americans have created their history, their literature, their very character, as well as their art, music, and dance, requires fresh analysis and examination.

International education is not a question of courses or materials of instruction alone. It has something to do, as well, with the style of instruction and what the instructor chooses to include, omit, or use by way of illustration. Heuristic approaches to classroom teaching are likely—but not inevitably—to lead to a better global understanding among students. Through skillful questioning, instructors may try to draw out of students, rather than pour into them, those interrelationships and interdependencies and tensions and dilemmas that exist among global people in terms of customs, traditions, and above all, ideals. "To question well is to teach well," an old saying goes; and it is the effectively phrased question that may spark the curiosity and interest of the student.

Seymour Fersh, the coordinator of Curriculum Development at Brevard Community College (FL) and long-time student and practitioner of international studies, explained that the distinction between curricular and extracurricular activities is essentially divisive and misleading. Curriculum, properly defined, includes all the activities a college or university provides to further the education of its students. If a global awareness and knowledge of international affairs are among the important aims of a college education, then the courses of study, the programs leading to a degree, as well as the activities provided outside of the formal classroom, are all part of the curriculum by which these objectives may be realized. Taking so broad a view of curriculum, however, further contributes to the difficulty of defining international education with precision.

The AASCU workshop did not develop a working definition of international education. Perhaps it is just as well that participants did not get sidetracked by trying to do so. For now, however, it might be useful to call attention to a definition of international education adopted by the Florida Council on Global Education. It reads as follows:

> " . . . education for a global perspective is not; a new curriculum, a new course . . . a political or world government movement; an ivory tower concept, or a panacea for domestic problems. It is an attempt to strengthen national well-being, foster domestic economic development, promote educational excellence, help citizens more fully develop human potential and a planned attempt to integrate global perspectives into existing school curriculum."[12]

In his remarks to the participants in the session dealing with undergraduate education, Harari characterized the efforts needed to internationalize the curriculum and the campus as both process and content. Since definitions of international education are so elusive and since a college curriculum is made up of in-class and out-of-class activities, what must be identified in any institution is a planned and systematic process by which a college or university proposes to move beyond where it may be and to develop, at an ever more sophisticated and academically rigorous level, the global concepts without which this generation of students cannot be considered well-educated. How then do colleges and universities begin the process of internationalizing the curriculum and the campus?

Where to Start?

Most colleges and universities are already involved in some aspects of international education. That is, they probably have at least a few foreign students in attendance and likely as not, they have some faculty who were born or were educated abroad and who have some ties to those countries. Undoubtedly, there are some courses in history, geography, and the humanities that have an international flavor. And, in all likelihood, some foreign language courses, perhaps French, Spanish, and German, are offered.

While all of this gives an institution a head start, these bits and pieces of international activity do not by themselves mean that the college or university has an internationalized curriculum or campus, nor even a commitment to establish one. One may even say, that by virtue of having activities that have such an international flavor and content, there may well be a tendency to feel that no more need be done to achieve global awareness among students. Such self-deception, in the light of dwindling budgets and resources and possible resistance to international matters by legislatures and boards, may well be tempting, even understandable. But to be content with the *status quo* is to ignore the pressing needs of world citizenship and global literacy. As Rose Hayden, executive director of the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, pointed out at the workshop.

> As a vital national education movement, international education is certainly coming of age. As many others have said, there has been a real paradigm shift. Those of us who have been in the field for some time have seen us move out of the realm of rhetoric and into the realm of ambulation and innovation.

It is no longer a question of whether or not to be "international" in curricular offerings. Instead, the question is how to build upon what an institution already has so as to develop the stuff whereby the campus and the curriculum can be considered international in outlook.

The "bare bones" of internationalizing the campus and the curriculum, according to Dean Alan H. Wheeler of the School of Education at Radford University (VA), include: (1) curiosity with regard to the program; (2) concern and care about the institution and its global responsibilities; (3) collaboration among the constituency of the institution as well as with those abroad; and (4) commitment to enrich the lives of students and faculty by

encouraging and, indeed, by providing for the development of a sensitive awareness of global issues.

The general advice provided at the conference was that an institution must get started from where it is. Since it is not feasible to wait for everyone to become similarly aware of the need to internationalize, it is enough if just a few faculty express an interest and are willing to begin making some plans and involving other faculty, students, administrators, and particularly, the president in those plans. The inspiration, guidance, and willingness to allocate some resources in dollars or in kind is a presidential decision that could be critical to survival.

An excellent and detailed plan for getting started was shared by Don Sikkink of St. Cloud State University (MN). Starting with an assessment of what students generally knew about international affairs and what St. Cloud students specifically knew, he quickly discovered that St. Cloud students, as do most students, required much more knowledge of international matters, as test results amply demonstrate. Entitled, "Internationalizing the Curriculum," the document described what the university did to "change the ethos of the campus," and listed the specific changes in curriculum and in institutional structure that followed. Many of the activities, initially, were nonacademic in nature and included foreign films, international festivals, and speakers and forums on world affairs—all of which helped to convey, in subtle yet pleasurable ways, not only the importance of developing an international climate on the St. Cloud campus, but also the necessity of encouraging the competence, the academic excellence, and the rigor appropriate in studies devoted to international affairs.

In this process, administration, faculty, students, even community, alumni, legislature, and the board of trustees all need to be encouraged to participate or, at the least, they need to be kep informed. But for specific change to take place—that is, to add new courses, to develop new programs, to create opportunities for faculty exchanges with other countries, to develop faculty expertise in global affairs, to attract new foreign students to the campus, and to make better provision for them—some centralized administrative structure may be needed. Such, at least, appeared to be the consensus at the workshop. On the assumption that that which is the responsibility of all (administration, students, faculty, and so on) readily becomes the responsibility of none, then action leading to the internationalization of the curriculum and the campus would be likely to benefit from the presence of an Office of International Programs. All indications are that an Office of International Programs, properly staffed and located conveniently to serve the campus, can provide a locus of information, coordination, leadership, and initiative.

The establishment of such an office will in most cases, require additional resources (a remote possibility during these austere days) or diverting funds from existing programs by reordering institutional priorities (a step that if not sensitively handled can cause widespread dissension and trigger faculty/administration bickering and interdepartmental strife). Yet, if institutional commitment to the international is achieved, then there should be a generally accepted willingness to establish such a centralized office.

Campus internationalization may require some course reorganization or change in degree requirements. Further, new administrative structures, perhaps some not yet thought through, may have to be created. Alternative reward systems for faculty may need to be developed. Teaching methods may need to be redesigned. Domestic and foreign students may need to meet one another in more varied settings. All of these activities may be said to be the process by which the internationalizing of the curriculum and the campus may go forward. If global awareness is to be internalized among students, then it must be more than an attempt to climb aboard the bandwagon of international education as a means of snaring a grant or gaining professional visibility. It must be more than grafting international programs onto a probably overworked faculty and barnacled curriculum.

It is well for institutions getting started to recognize that courses and programs can change, international studies can be added, foreign students can be attracted to the campus, and faculty exchanges can flourish—without in any way altering the ethnocentric character of the campus. Something must take place in the faculty and eventually in the students that will make them more receptive to the world beyond the borders of the United States.

In this connection, G. Robert Ross, president of Western Washington University, quoted from the best-selling book *Megatrends*. The author, John Naisbitt, declared that the United States has become a "bottoms up" society. "We at the top had better learn to ride the horse in the direction in which it is going." While Dr. Ross outlined some of the things a president might do to encourage the internationalization of the curriculum and the campus, he avowed that essentially it was a "bottoms up" approach rather than a "trickle down" one that would work best. International education will grow if faculty become and remain committed to it. Only then will something happen. If the president alone is committed to it, or if one merely waits for funding, then little of importance can be expected to develop.

Ross pointed out that sometimes ethnic minorities on a campus can be encouraged to develop some interest in their own roots—a starting point of the campus effort to internationalize. Sometimes a president might make it possible for a faculty member to be given a half-load for a

period of time, the remaining half to be used to develop the international dimension of the college through a new curriculum proposal, or for the development of appropriate course materials, or to prepare the documentation needed to secure grants of various kinds. Having nurtured a commitment to international, what policies should be developed to guide the program during its initial years and to ensure the institution's continuing support?

Establishing Policies for International Education

In the process of internationalizing the curriculum and the campus it is essential that, before the process goes very far, a number of significant policy questions should be decided upon, written down, and made available to the college community. President Walter Waetjen of Cleveland State University spoke to the question of establishing policies for international education within the context of the professional school. However, much of what he says has applicability to general education as well, and so his remarks offer a starting point for the discussion of institutional policies that may be tailored to an institution's special needs.

- **Preliminary Policy Planning**: The first element in making policy is to agree to have one. Often policies emerge after the fact, after an institution has agreed to do certain things internally or externally–that is, with another college in another part of the world. While it is vital to learn from mistakes, carefully thought out policies established in advance may serve to prevent some mistakes, or at least to minimize the damage they might do.
- **Curriculum Considerations**: Some decision should be made, in advance, as to what proportion of the curriculum should be devoted to international education. This is a tough decision to make since, in a real sense, every course worthy of its name should have global aspects included in what is taught in the classroom. But if specific courses, programs, and opportunities for global understanding are to be provided on the campus, some decision should be made as to how much of an international "flavor" constitutes a reasonable–or even an optimum–proportion of the curriculum that should be especially identified as having the international thrust that is needed to internationalize.

- **Library Holdings**: Similar policy decisions might also be made with regard to the number of books in the library that ought to relate specifically to global concerns.
- **Student Issues**: Policy decisions should be made with regard to the number of foreign students the campus can effectively educate at any one time and how rapidly additional foreign students should be encouraged to attend. Shall "full faith and credit" be given to students who come from foreign institutions to study in U.S. institutions? Should similar credit be given to U.S. students who take some of their work abroad? Policy decisions are required as to where foreign students shall live, how they can be brought into the mainstream of campus life, how they can best serve to enrich the international learning opportunities for all students.
- **Faculty Exchange Policies**: Policy decisions need to be made with regard to the number of professors who should be encouraged to go abroad during any one year. How will they be compensated? Who will teach their vacated classes? How many foreign professors should be encouraged to spend a period of time on the campus? As to the period of time, what are the minimum and maximum blocks of time that would seem especially desirable from the point of view of the international process and the contribution the instructor can make to the learning opportunities for students? In some foreign universities, professors are expected to lecture to a thousand or more students at a time. While large groups are not unknown in U.S. universities, classes of such size remain a rare phenomenon here. Does the U.S. professor realize that huge classes are common in some countries abroad? Policies, with regard to credit toward tenure or seniority and for promotion for the professor who serves abroad for a year or more, need to be clearly set forth and explained to personnel committees of departments and the college so that recognition for service abroad can be clearly and fairly evaluated on an equitable basis. Policy questions need to be raised with regard to annual increments of salary for U.S. professors teaching abroad and levels of compensation need to be determined for foreign professors who are teaching here.
- **The Nature of Exchange Agreements**: Much of what takes place under the umbrella of international is developed on an informal, *ad hoc* basis. How much is such informality desirable? How much scope should be given to departments to internationalize by making informal agreements and exchanges with sister departments in institutions abroad? What reporting mechanisms should be required and how far should departments,

through their chairpersons, be permitted to make commitments on behalf of the college? If agreements are only to be formal–that is, in the form of contracts or other documents, such as memoranda of understanding–what should these agreements contain? Who signs them? If the institution is a part of a state system, how much reporting to the central office is required and what should those reports contain? A major policy decision needs to be made as to the countries with which student and faculty exchanges will take place and in which language the professors will teach and the students will receive instruction. "There must be a policy decision made between the cooperating institutions as to whether the students or the faculty to be exchanged are going to be taught in their native language, that is, English in our case, or in the language indigenous to the university to which they are going. An aspect to the language question is whether or not English will be taught as a second language to help foreign students and professors who come to this country and whether U.S. students and professors will be helped in mastering the language of the country in which they are studying." Policies on these questions need to be formulated in advance, even if they are modified frequently in the light of experience. They serve to make sure that as many problems as can be anticipated will be considered in advance with a view toward deflecting their negative impact.

- **Institutional Expectations**: It should be part of policy to clearly set forth the expectations that the institution hopes to achieve by internationalizing the campus and the curriculum. The institution should provide written answers to such questions as: Why send students overseas? Why send faculty overseas? Why have faculty and students from institutions abroad come to our college or university? What hope is there of achieving our expectations? How will we know if we have succeeded?

- **Internal Organization**: Policy decisions should be made with regard to the internal organization of international education, its funding, the kind of planning that is to take place, and who shall do the planning. If there is to be faculty and student involvement–and such involvement is essential–how are faculty and students chosen, for what period of time, and what authority should such a planning group have? If a faculty committee is to be responsible for planning, "that faculty committee should report to some academic administrator so that there is a direct line of response and also responsibility."

- **Resources**: In internationalizing the campus and the curriculum, resources in kind are often made available for international programs. Some policy needs to be set down with regard to such matters as the

use of office space, laboratory and computer facilities, research equipment, and the like. If visiting faculty from other countries are expected to come to the college, then what policy with regard to their housing should appear to be most desirable? Care must be exercised that foreign faculty are not humiliated by make-shift accommodations or by campus and community discrimination and hostility.

These policy questions are easier to ask than to answer. It is not easy to be both fair and flexible, objective, yet alert to special opportunities. It is difficult to be consistent since economic, political, and global realities beyond the control of any college or university may create problems or establish opportunities or alter circumstances, thereby changing the environment in which international education is to be developed. As a result, in some substantial measure, internationalizing the curriculum and the campus requires some intuitive responses and, on occasion, high-risk decision making.

No policy statement ought to be etched in stone, but a clear set of policy guidelines will help an institution crown its international academic program with a high degree of excellence.

Internationalizing the Academic Program

Internationalizing Undergraduate General Education

Participants of the workshop were very much aware that internationalizing the general education component of the undergraduate curriculum was the most difficult challenge facing those institutions which sought to make the appropriate reforms. As has already been noted, lack of consensus on the nature of undergraduate education produces little agreement as to what constitutes an appropriate international component.

As Sven Groennings, head of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), reminded workshop participants: "This field [international education] is undergoing a paradigm shift as we move past the elite exposure on which we focused a number of years ago, to developing the international general education needed for a new era in commerce and communications." Commerce, he continued, is more important in hastening the internationalization of the nation's curriculum than are matters of national security. Among the issues to which general education must give some significant attention are questions of international com-

munication, the mining of seabeds, international migration, transnational environmental concerns, mineral and food resources, and financial questions involving international currency, trade and credit.

Judging from the applications received at FIPSE, Groennings noted that "all manner of institutions in this country are telling us that colleges and universities are trying to adapt to either changing technology or a changing world." This workshop, Groennings correctly reminded the group, was not on whether to have international education but on how to go about doing it. "The recent upbeat tone of advocacy that we have witnessed in conference after conference has been yielding to a similarly upbeat tone, but one dealing with practical applications."

There is increasing awareness, Groennings holds, that there ought to be international or global perspectives throughout the curriculum, not just an available course. "The driving thought now is that the international dimension should not be some smattering 'add-ons' of courses around some periphery of today's supermarket curriculum. It should be not only for experts but an increasingly important international content should be fused into general education."

In a similar vein, the Association of American Colleges in 1981 adopted a resolution that said, "In a world of increasing interdependence for both individuals and nations, it is imperative that liberal studies provide students with a global perspective."

How to internationalize the undergraduate curriculum was the focus of attention of a workshop panel discussion, at which it was evident that there was little consensus as to what constituted the internationalization of general education. If a college or a university has student exchanges with foreign countries; if it has a study abroad program; if it has a respectable number of foreign students on the campus; if a foreign language is required for graduation, or if some credits in international education are made graduation requirements; if there are area studies, majors, or minors in such fields as Latin American Studies or Asian Studies; and if there are a number of grants in international education; dare one still raise the question as to whether or not the undergraduate curriculum has been internationalized?

In addressing this question, Maurice Harari indicated that his concern was that all of these projects, while desirable in and of themselves, were not enough unless international education infused the entire undergraduate curriculum in terms of the internal content taught in all courses, and international education projects on and off campus were well-integrated as part of the overall mission of the institution. Yet if these activities do not develop the awareness and sensitivity needed in a globally literate person, then the international objectives have not been achieved.

John Petersen, the assistant vice president for Academic Affairs at Western Kentucky University, enumerated an impressive array of international activities taking place on his campus. Yet, he pondered whether all this meant that his undergraduate, general education curriculum was, in fact, internationalized. He noted some of the major realities of trying to revise the undergraduate sequence since the departments are so jealous of what they considered to be their "turf." Adding a requirement at the expense of existing courses affects enrollment in that department and with it the budget and the number of positions that the department is entitled to have. Appointments, tenure, and promotion often are dependent on the general education undergraduate curriculum, and to tamper with it trespasses on sacred ground.

Among the key elements in raising the level of international consciousness on the campus of Western Kentucky, the following were reported by Petersen to be the most important:

- The international education resources available at the college were inventoried and identified.
- Faculty, staff, administration, and leadership in the academic community worked together to encourage the Board of Regents to establish an international committee. In this way, international programs garnered greater visibility and enhanced status on the campus.
- Institutional realities on the campus were sensitively evaluated so that continued support from faculty, and particularly from the departments, was enlisted to build a foundation for the development of an international dimension that is consistent with the continuing general mission of Western Kentucky University.

Internationalizing the Professional School

While the drive to internationalize the curriculum and the campus in general undergraduate education is motivated largely by internal forces–faculty, administration, and students–the drive to internationalize the professional school is more often than not motivated by external considerations. In the professional school, internationalization of the curriculum has made substantial progress because self-interest, the needs of business and industry, and the demands of accrediting agencies have all combined to encourage–even demand–that the curriculum of those preparing for careers in business and in engineering graduate with a significant awareness of the global environment in which they are likely to function as professionals.

Another characteristic of the professional school, Harold F. Robinson, chancellor of Western Carolina University (NC), pointed out, is that the overwhelming number of foreign students attending U.S. universities do so in schools of business, engineering, agriculture, and teacher education. Those in general education or the humanities and letters are far fewer. This imposes on professional schools a special obligation to prepare their international students by helping to provide them with basic global understanding. Also, in many Third-World countries in which new universities are currently being established or existing universities are being modified, there is a tendency to try to adopt or adapt part of the U.S. university model by organizing their universities around professional schools. As a result, U.S. colleges and universities have a special responsibility to see that the curricula of these new universities make ample provision for global awareness.

Schools of Business: Groennings pointed out that in business schools there is a widespread recognition that curricula has lagged behind the development and the potential of international business. "Doing American business today, means doing business with the rest of the world. The international market is everywhere." As a result, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), which is the accrediting authority, "has become an engine of reform." The accreditation standard set in 1980 requires that every student be exposed to the international dimension through one or more elements in the curriculum. AACSB allows a school of business to determine how this standard can best be met. In some schools basic international business concepts are incorporated into the general business education core. In others, elective courses in international business are offered, or international business concepts are incorporated into the students' area of specialization–accounting, management, finance, or marketing.

Schools of Education: The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) emphasized multicultural education in the Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education, which it adopted in May 1977 and which became effective January 1, 1979.[13] These standards refer specifically to multicultural education as "preparation for the social, political, and economic realities that individuals experience in culturally diverse and complex human encounters. These realities have both national and international dimensions." It is clear, however, that teachers are still not

generally being trained within a global context at a level commensurate with the needs of a global society. Since the need to prepare teachers to teach in such a society is already upon us, current attempts to internationalize the preparation of teachers have been going on *after* the teacher has been certified, usually through some form of in-service education, rather than at the preservice level. Internal forces are not yet strong enough to generate change nor have external sources–accrediting agencies, school districts, and state boards–been adamant in their demands that those who prepare to teach graduate with a greater sensitivity to global concerns.

The division of teacher education between liberal arts and education schools heightens tensions and "turf" questions. If there is to be an international component in teacher education, what should be omitted from an already crowded program? Should the international be offered in the academic or in the pedagogical area? Should teachers who do student teaching abroad be credited for this aspect of their work and so qualify for a certificate? Legitimate questions can be raised whether teaching experience gained in England or France, Peru or Botswana offers the appropriate experience that student teaching is intended to provide.

Yet, some progress is being made. The International Council on Education for Teaching (ICET) and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) drafted a statement on the international aspects of teacher education, which states that "international education should be considered a fundamental part of basic education; global perspectives should permeate all aspects of the teacher education program." Although formally and unanimously approved by the Board of AACTE, this principle has yet to be converted into a standard against which accreditation will be measured. However, it may be that the pace of change will accelerate and the international dimension of teacher education will be recognized in the accrediting standards before very long.

Schools of Agriculture: Charles Smallwood, dean of Agriculture and Home Economics at California State University at Fresno, pointed out that because of the critical need of Third-World countries for an adequate food supply, U.S. schools of agriculture have a particular responsibility. That responsibility includes the training in research of foreign students who come to U.S. professional schools, and the exchange of students and faculty with those countries. In many cases the relationships so established are long-lasting. Research begun in this country may continue when the student leaves for home. When the project is completed, the results of that research may be shared between the U.S. college or university and the university of the

developing country from which the student came. Other projects and exchanges may then be undertaken either as a follow-up to the initial project or as a totally new research problem. Faculty who consult abroad, conduct research, or are members of international committees or study teams "become aware of the international opportunities and are more receptive to international involvement after they have been in those kinds of assignments."

Fragmentation of International Education at the Professional School Level

Among the concerns expressed by Harari is the question of the relationship between the relatively independent but gradual development of international education in the undergraduate, general education curriculum and that which is taking place at a more rapid and more pragmatic level in some professional schools. His concern was over the need to integrate and articulate these seemingly separate developments. "There is not enough articulation or a 'thinkthrough' of the international mission of the university as a cohesive package for the institution as a whole." When the School of Agriculture sends researchers to help Mexico improve its raisin industry, does this have any ripple effects in the university as a whole? Do students in other schools of the university share in the benefits and in the opportunities that may stem from such activity? His concern was for both the insufficient attention paid to global education as well as the fragmentation of international education on many campuses of the country. "I very strongly urge you to plan and implement systematically," he said, "the integration of the curriculum, on and off campus, including the professional schools."

The Role of Foreign Language Study in Internationalizing the Campus

The study of foreign languages is an integral part of the thrust toward internationalizing the curriculum and the campus. It was a subject of concern for the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. Yet, the relationship between foreign languages and the attempt to internationalize the campus and the curriculum has not been completely understood. The existence of foreign language departments has an old and venerable history. These departments generally sought to infuse those majoring in a foreign language with a competence in the classical literature of that language. Secondarily, the aim of the foreign language major was to be able to communicate with nationals of that country in a reasonably competent way. Too often, those who have studied a foreign language have mastered enough to pass the course but emerge

unable even to carry on a simple everyday conversation in the target language.

Under the impact of international education, a shift in the thinking of foreign language departments is taking place. There is increasing emphasis on conversational skills and on the utilitarian aspects of foreign language study. There is concern that students who graduate should have mastered a foreign language at a sufficient level of competence so as to be able to function and to communicate in that language. Those who are preparing for the world of business or engineering where their business may take them overseas need the ability to speak to their peers in a coherent way. Thus, conversational competence, not necessarily literary accomplishment, is the yardstick by which the success of foreign language instruction seems increasingly to be measured.

A result of this shift in thinking has been a change in methods of instruction. Just as international education has been "democratized," in that there is now the expectation that all students will develop with global insights, so too there is the expectation that a person who is educated will have mastered a foreign language. Foreign language instruction lends itself readily to the application of educational technology; students now use language laboratories and computers to teach themselves a foreign language. Mastery in a foreign language may thus be measured not by how many hours have been spent in a classroom, but by the degree of actual language competence that can be demonstrated over a period of time. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language states that "measurable foreign language proficiency is integral to the advancement of the professional and essential to credibility."

There is also a movement away from a specific language requirement, at least as expressed in so many years of study. Instead, the requirement is or should be to attain some proficiency, regardless of the length of time it takes to achieve it. Proficiency testing today is of such a level of sophistication that it can measure language competence with a good deal of precision. Students who have acquired proficiency as demonstrated by such a test—by studying abroad for a time, by living with a family overseas, or by self-learning through textbooks and video or audio tapes—are increasingly being credited with meeting such language requirements as may exist without ever having attended a formal class.

Another major problem in internationalizing the curriculum through foreign language is how colleges provide for what Rose Hayden, executive director of the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, referred to as the "less commonlies," that is, those less commonly taught languages, such as Japanese, Chinese, Russian, Arabic, Hindi, and Swahili, which are spoken by four-fifths of the world's population but are

studied by very few Americans. These are often critical languages and yet, because we are tied to Full-Time Enrollments (FTEs) for funding, are difficult for most institutions to offer. Some real thought and imagination should be applied to establish language consortia so as to enable clusters of colleges to offer one or more of the languages. There has been some promising interinstitutional cooperation in this area and there is a need to build on that experience. Thus, a student from one institution who wishes to study Chinese–a language not available at the home college–may do so and expect to receive expert instruction and full credit on the home campus for study undertaken elsewhere–on another campus or in China.

Language study in and of itself may not contribute greatly to the sensitivity in global insights that is sought through international education. However, it is best viewed as a tool by which such sensitivity to and greater knowledge of foreign countries and their developmental needs may more readily be identified. One need only be a tourist to know how much just a few words in a foreign language will help one get along in a strange country. Just as U.S. scholarship, research, business, and technological innovation require science, mathematics, and computer skills, so too foreign language needs to be diligently cultivated.

The International Student

When about 150 years ago Americans were debating the desirability of common, public schools in which children of the rich and poor would be educated at taxpayers' expense, one of the very difficult questions raised about the equity of such a proposal was: What justification is there for taxing one person to pay for the education of another person's child? In due course this question was resolved in favor, not only of the common elementary school, but eventually in favor of the American high school as well.

Rationale

Today, the issue may be couched in global terms. Why should the U.S. taxpayer pay for, or otherwise subsidize, the education of students from other countries? Obviously, the parallel is not exact, and there are differences in levels of financial support of foreign students among independent, church-related, and state-supported colleges, universities, and community colleges. Many institutions, moreover, in an attempt to

bolster declining enrollments specifically try to recruit foreign students. Among state colleges and universities, the addition of foreign students may improve an institution's FTE or otherwise enhance its budget, but the taxpayer is sharing some substantial burden to educate the offspring of parents who live outside the borders of the United States.

There are some graduate departments, as in engineering or computer science, that would have to be shut down were it not for the foreign student population. There are some who think of education for foreign students as a means of helping the United States in its balance of payments, since, in effect, this country is providing or exporting educational services. In some instances, there is interest in foreign students as a means of "enriching" opportunities on campus for all students. In other instances, there is fear that some foreign students may steal America's technological secrets and know-how and thereby give their home countries a competitive edge. As the report "Absence of Decision"[14] makes clear, these issues have not been resolved. There remain substantial questions among boards of higher education and in the legislatures of several states as to the necessity for and the wisdom of subsidizing the education of students from abroad.

Craig Dean Willis, president of Lock Haven State University (PA), said that boards and legislatures are under considerable pressure when faced with such statements from local citizens:

- Why was my child denied admission when there are foreign students in the program?
- Why is my child being taught by a teaching assistant from a foreign country who can barely speak English?
- Aren't the foreign students we train taking jobs away from U.S. students?

These prevailing attitudes make it difficult to identify an approach for dealing with the still-growing foreign student population in the United States.[15] The argument that we are also preparing men and women who will occupy positions of prime ministers, cabinet officers, corporate heads and who will, upon assuming power, look with favor upon the United States makes little impression.

These attitudes make it very difficult for colleges and universities to plan an educational program for foreign students. The foreign student, one must remember, is many things. He (or she) is the student in medical school on the verge of becoming a physician. The foreign student may be completing doctoral work in science or social science, business, or engineering. The foreign student may be a freshman entering a four-year institution,

or the foreign student may be one of thousands who attend community colleges. Each of these categories of foreign students, and shades in between, requires sensitive treatment and careful decision making with regard to funding, educational programs, admissions policies, and campus life. In general, there is a visceral, if not cognitive, recognition by legislatures and by state boards of higher education that a mixture of foreign students would provide a more heterogeneous environment for the state's students and thereby provide enrichment and intercultural opportunities for them. But the evidence to support precisely what it is that foreign students do provide by way of academic or cultural enrichment is not easy to gather in detail, with the result that some suspicion persists of the real value of foreign students on the college campuses.

Contributions of Foreign Students

The state of Oregon, for example, approached the problem by proposing that universities give tuition waivers if there is concrete evidence that the foreign student will make a specific contribution to the citizens of the state. The Legislature of Oregon went on to define precisely what such contributions might be, including a certain number of hours working in the state's public schools, a certain number of hours working with Oregon's industry, and working in areas of continuing or adult education or with the handicapped. John Reichard, executive vice president of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, expressed the view that the Oregon approach might be a useful experiment that clearly will be closely watched. "Most foreign students," he said, "do like to contribute. In fact, many are frustrated that they seem to be able to give so little. So that's an interesting development that we all should keep an eye on."

Just as the workshop assumed that internationalizing the campus was necessary and desirable, it also assumed that the presence of foreign students on campus was beneficial and hence focused on ways to integrate foreign students into the mainstream of campus life, on the one hand, and ways to encourage their contribution to the learning environment for all students, on the other.

Josef Mestenhauser, director of the Office of the Advisor to Foreign Students at the University of Minnesota, developed his view that U.S. faculty and students can learn a great deal more from foreign students than is generally thought to be the case. He outlined his proposal, implemented at the University of Minnesota, in which some foreign students would become teaching assistants and in that capacity be able to present subjects such as U.S. history or American literature from the point of view of a foreign nation. Thus, point and counterpoint of historical and

literary interpretation and national perspective would sharpen both the U.S. student and faculty member while contributing to the education and development of the foreign student. Such issues as language barriers, reluctance on the part of professors to yield their authority, belief that the foreign student is not sufficiently prepared, even in matters dealing with his or her own country, and scheduling problems all make the implementation of this program difficult but by no means impossible. It is Mestenhauser's belief that using foreign students as teaching assistants "will contribute to cross-cultural understanding at a level that can be achieved in no other way."

Problems of Foreign Students

Several foreign students contributed to the workshop, outlining some of their frustrations with U.S. campuses:

- Foreign students coming from countries where English is used as the national language still experience difficulty with slang and colloquial expressions and with modes of interaction.
- Foreign students experience difficulty with the pace of life in America, which limits their ability to spend time developing conversational skills and friendships.
- Foreign students often find the registration process bewildering and noted the importance of a Foreign Students' Office and of an initial orientation program to help them find a place to live, settle into their accommodations, and find places to buy appropriate and adequate food and clothing.
- Foreign students were disappointed that U.S. students seemed less curious about their countries of origin (and did not take advantage to learn from them on a face-to-face, informal basis) than foreign students were about the United States. The thought was expressed that perhaps an Office of International Services should have some orientation programs for U.S. students so as to encourage them to interact more readily with students from abroad.
- Many foreign students found interaction with their instructors difficult. In foreign countries, professors occupy a more exalted niche in social circles than they do in this country. As a result, there is a great deal of diffidence among foreign students in raising questions, calling upon professors for clarification, or asking for additional help. That U.S. professors differ widely in how they treat their own U.S. students is lost on the foreign student who also experiences wide variations in the

teacher attitude, helpfulness, availability, and thoughtfulness. Some orientation of professors was suggested as a possible remedy.

- Foreign students were dismayed by U.S. testing procedures, especially multiple choice tests, which, they argued, do not accurately reflect what they have learned.
- The tuition differential for foreign students was a source of concern, since their "out-of-state" status required that they pay full tuition in state colleges and universities. And this, of course, puts a burden on them, their families, or, if there is some sponsorship by their government, on the governments of relatively poor countries.
- Most foreign students, when attending a university in their own country, tend to live at home. As a result, finding a place to live becomes a major initial hurdle. While information on dorm facilities is provided, foreign students need special help in finding other available living accommodations.
- Foreign students feel that both faculty advisors and classroom instructors need to be better prepared and more knowledgeable about other countries. The foreign student, whose country may well be under discussion, may be very sensitive to differences in interpretation offered by those who have had extended experience in their home country as compared with those who have not.

Possible Solutions

Conference participants offered the following ideas for achieving better integration of foreign students and enabling them to contribute more importantly to the enrichment of campus and community life:

- Some colleges have established an international house or international dormitories for foreign students. This concept has disadvantages as well as advantages. For example, the student may be more isolated from the rest of the campus, yet the arrangement does allow foreign students to form their own community and help one another. Some modification of this concept is to encourage U.S. students to share dorms with foreign students and to accept them as roommates. However, this requires the intervention of skilled counselors to hold periodic intercultural meetings to explain why U.S. and foreign students react the way they do to certain situations.
- In some colleges, foreign students are assigned a U.S. "buddy" who can help at least during the initial few weeks of "culture shock." A more

sophisticated modification of this is the Language Partner Program, in which a U.S. student is teamed up with a foreign student for practice in spoken and written English.

- International potluck dinners, international social events, or a combination of these activities provide the opportunity to bridge cultural gaps. At Kutztown State University (PA), for example, an International Weekend is held, in which students from a number of colleges mingle during programs of music and dance and have the opportunity to dine together and share ethnic food with U.S. students. At the College of Staten Island of the City University of New York, President Edmond Volpe reported considerable success using ethnic students as the cutting edge for a continuing boroughwide program of ethnic festivities, which has become a major event in the area. However, the major problem on nearly all campuses is how to get large numbers of U.S. students to participate, a problem that has to be worked out skillfully, and requires community involvement as well. A number of campuses have established an International Club of foreign students, which can take the leadership in initiating and planning social functions.
- A number of campuses have created Foreign Students' Speakers Bureaus so that civic organizations and elementary and secondary schools who wish to hear a foreign student describe his or her experiences could readily find one available. Such a speakers bureau has the potential for generating goodwill in the community.
- Some colleges encourage faculty and community hospitality for foreign students, which can take the form of urging faculty to invite foreign students to their homes for a meal and conversation or of having active members of the community in which the college is located invite students for dinner and family gatherings. On occasion, members of the community have been known to provide housing for a time for foreign students at no or low cost. Such occasions can provide foreign students with significant insight into the U.S. character, society, and government.
- College and universities can take advantage of their expertise by allowing foreign students to serve as teaching assistants, guest lecturers, resource persons, and tutors to U.S. language students.
- Some colleges have asked their Office of International Programs to provide orientation about foreign students, not only to professors, but to custodial, security, and clerical staffs as well. In this way, foreign students can be treated with greater patience and courtesy when they

try to register or otherwise show up on the campus in unexpected places at unanticipated times.

Administrative Issues

While it was clearly evident that, among the campuses participating in the AASCU international workshop, foreign students were welcome, there was also a realistic awareness of a number of persistent problems:

- What shall be done with unscrupulous third-party recruiters who, in effect, serve as collegiate "headhunters" by promising to recruit foreign students? These offers sometimes appear tempting, as additional foreign students may help take up the slack of declining enrollments.
- What shall be done with foreign students who begin their studies, then either for political or financial reasons are unable to continue?
- What shall be done with tuition defaults by foreign students? Should colleges and universities require a year or more in advance tuition payments?
- How shall the role of foreign students on the campus be evaluated in terms of the achievements of foreign students themselves and in terms of what they contribute to campus enrichment?
- How shall colleges and universities deal with the backlash against foreign students? This is an especially difficult question during a period of economic decline, such as that from which the nation is barely emerging.
- How shall political and academic freedom be accorded foreign students? This is especially troublesome when the students' country of origin becomes an enemy of the United States, or engages in hostile action against it, or otherwise takes a critical stand. The role of foreign students in campus demonstrations, as on subjects such as disarmament and abortion, can become particularly sensitive and raise significant problems in college and community relationships.
- What consistent, reasonably uniform policy with regard to foreign students should be adopted? Currently, there is no single national policy. On each campus, foreign students are dealt with more or less successfully by following policies and practices that appear to serve that institution best.

These problems all need to be worked out in due course against a backdrop of America's changing role in world affairs. Given this situation, will the United States remain attractive to foreign students? And if not, should U.S. colleges and universities make a concerted effort to try to make it so?

Foreign students come to U.S. colleges and universities having enormous expectations that, over a period of time, are generally realized. Nevertheless, foreign students must exercise a great deal of patience and often experience a great deal of frustration and disappointment. Some of this may be inevitable, since no student can be altogether shielded from such difficulties. In addition to the suggestions offered above, one element in the successful integration of the foreign students is the presence of instructors who have some insight into global affairs from having visited or lived in the countries from which some of the students come. They can be enormously helpful in enriching the learning experiences for all students. It is for this reason that there has been an enormously increased interest in faculty exchanges with universities in foreign lands. Increased faculty exchanges multiply these positive effects.

Faculty Exchanges

Rationale

In her remarks of faculty exchanges, Barbara B. Burn, the director of International Programs at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst and immediate past president of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), told the story of a German professor at the University of Massachusetts who was teaching American literature. He was asked, "What do you think those students are getting out of it?" After a thoughtful moment, the German professor replied, "Knowledge needs distance." He went on to explain how, from his very special vantage point, he was teaching Walt Whitman that morning to his graduate seminar made up of U.S. students. This distance, this rather different perspective, is essentially what faculty exchanges are designed to accomplish.

If the international dimension is to be a part of each subject taught in a college or university, then one important way to achieve the distance and perspective is to have professors from a foreign country teach U.S. students. Another way is to send U.S. professors abroad for a time to ingest other perspectives in the expectation that, in due course, they too will be able to bring new international dimensions to the courses that they have

been teaching for many years. What could be more refreshing than to have a professor of U.S. history, who has been teaching the same course for fifteen years or so, go abroad and, in the process of teaching and doing research, find out how European professors are teaching the same subject. By bringing facets of that perspective back to his or her own classroom, a dimension of the international is brought to bear on the nation's history and, an equally important dividend, faculty renewal is achieved and morale is enhanced.

Types of Exchanges

Faculty exchanges are complex matters and may take several forms. The first, most common, and perhaps most clear-cut of all is the reciprocal exchange. In this form of faculty exchange, a faculty member from a U.S. college or university exchanges places with a faculty member in the same discipline at a college or university abroad. That exchange often involves not only reciprocity at the departmental level, but in housing and other amenities, as well. While no faculty exchange is altogether trouble free, the reciprocal exchange is probably the most cost effective. The U.S. faculty member going abroad for at least 339 days out of the 365-day year may, in fact, achieve some income tax advantages that may be enough of an incentive to participate in the exchange.

Other ways of developing interest in study, research, and teaching abroad may be one-way exchanges in which a faculty member makes his or her own arrangements. This requires substantial flexibility on the part of both institutions and a willingness for faculty members to make sure that their responsibilities on the home campus can be accommodated for during their absence. A great many of such *ad hoc* arrangements have been made and, in some cases, are encouraged, since they not only help to provide an international experience for the U.S. faculty members but also become an important element in an overall program of faculty development.

Problems with Faculty Exchanges

Earl Kline, director of International Studies at The College of Charleston (SC), pointed out that the "faculty exchange experience, living abroad in an alien culture in a daily interactive process, with not only the academic community but with the country community, is a much deepening and enriching experience." Yet, while there is general agreement on this score, the small group discussions indicated some real problems that impede the development of faculty exchange programs:

- A faculty member who is out of sight is often out of mind when it comes to salary increments. All too often, the inability of faculty members to make their presence felt when increases are being determined means that faculty members teaching abroad may be denied the increase to which they might otherwise have been entitled.
- Similarly, faculty members who are abroad may have promotions delayed and perhaps, ironically, tenure may be denied. This results partly because faculty members were unable to bring their resumes up to date or otherwise to present their case effectively at the department level. Occasionally, fiscal crises rock the home campus, and the faculty member who is away is often the one who is easiest to let go.
- When faculty members come from foreign countries to teach in U.S. colleges and universities, they often speak English so poorly that they make inadequate instructors. Students stay away from their classes and otherwise complain about poor or ineffective teaching. Sometimes, the style of teaching is not suited to the U.S. classroom, and thus additional problems are created on the home campus. Students might complain, on the one hand, of excessive authoritarianism in the classroom, and on the other, of inaccessibility or insufficient guidance and direction.
- Not infrequently, disappointment results from the terms of the exchange as faculty members go abroad or come here, expecting one thing but finding another. A distinguished professor from a foreign country comes to a U.S. campus with the intent of teaching advanced courses, only to find that since few students enrolled, the course had to be canceled, requiring the distinguished professor to teach a beginning level course. Many professors from foreign countries do far less teaching than their U.S. counterparts, and they are often shocked by the academic load they are expected to carry. U.S. professors, on the other hand, may find that they are teaching larger classes than they had expected and that the library and other instructional media are extremely lacking. How to equalize teaching load and teaching conditions between institutions engaging in faculty exchanges requires detailed development.
- One of the biggest problems on the home campus is the glaring inability of some colleges and universities to utilize the experience of the professor who has been abroad or to make widely available to the campus community the talents and expertise of the visiting professor from abroad. All too often, the professor from a foreign country may be introduced at an early faculty meeting, given an assignment, and then essentially ignored. The U.S. professor who returns from an assignment overseas may or may not be welcomed back, but very soon gets immers-

ed in the work that was left behind, and little attempt is made to have the person share with the academic community the nature of the experience.

Exchange Guidelines

Charles E. Smith, chancellor of the University of Tennessee at Martin, described a rather sophisticated but still developing program of faculty exchanges at his institution. "Faculty exchanges," he said, "are more difficult to consummate than our student exchanges. Language and cultural barriers, discipline mismatches, family complications, housing accommodation inadequacies, institutional policy variances, and academic challenge differences are among the most common problems. . . ." Among the major guidelines that he found useful in establishing faculty exchanges were the following:

- A broad base of support within the academic community is needed for the very concept of international student and faculty exchanges.
- There must be adequate commitment of staff and financial resources.
- Flexibility in policies related to faculty exchanges is important.
- Faculty interest in exchange opportunities is dependent on the degree to which incentives are well developed and clearly articulated. It is extremely important that exchange participation is perceived as a positive faculty development activity that will aid a faculty member's professional career.
- Early identification of the countries with which exchange programs are to be sought is desirable. It is probably better to limit exchanges to include a few countries with which there have been previous formal and informal contacts.
- Institutionally supported preparatory training for prospective exchange faculty is useful.
- Develop an environment in which internationals are welcome and accepted by the campus community, as well as by the external community.
- Faculty exchange programs must not be used as an attempt to solve other types of institutional problems. For example, they should not be used to relieve overstaffing in a department or to "[drive] away tenured incompetents."
- Patience is a must. "There are no quick fixes in developing a viable exchange program. Unless you happen to be a major recognized uni-

versity, negotiations are likely to go slowly and we must be prepared to take a step at a time."

In his summary, Chancellor Smith concluded, "Faculty exchanges represent one of the most complex dimensions of international program development. They require patience, careful planning, and tangible supports. At best, they represent a long-term investment with few short-term pay-offs. At UT-Martin we believe the investment is worthwhile and we are content to wait for the dividends of the future."

Achieving an International Perspective

Faculty and professional jealousies are intense, and there is often a tendency to demean, rather than to exalt or otherwise highlight, the experiences the U.S. faculty member may have obtained abroad. Greater opportunities must be created for U.S. professors, particularly those who have had exchange experiences, to share with their colleagues what they have learned. And foreign professors must also have the chance to hold seminars and discussion groups with faculty and students in order to describe what conditions are like in their native lands. Dr. Kline reported on a number of brown bag lunches that helped accomplish this very purpose. In some cases, professors are given a small additional stipend in order to lecture about their experiences in other classrooms.

What appears to be lacking in both student and faculty exchanges is the quality that some participants referred to as "synergism." Nearly all institutions are eager to attract larger number of students from abroad and exchange a greater number of professors with those of other countries. Yet, most campuses do not think in global terms. These concerns with international aspects of faculty development and student enrichment have not yet been internalized so that there remains some doubt as to whether students, even from campuses that are most international in outlook, leave those institutions with a global perspective. How to achieve that perspective remains the unfinished business of internationalizing the campus and the curriculum. How to achieve funding to bring that about is the topic to which we now turn.

Mobilizing Needed Resources

"I would say as much as 90 percent of what needs to be done as a basic foundation for internationalizing on a campus can be done without a single nickel from the outside. It is an internal commitment; rearrangement of resources and renewal of faculty dedication, since faculty are the key to change, plus administrative support." So asserted Maurice Harari at the AASCU workshop. With this view there was not universal agreement. It was pointed out that clearly an Office of International Programs costs money; subsidizing faculty to go abroad costs money; bringing foreign students to the campus costs money; and establishing new programs and engaging in activities with a distinctive international flavor also cost money.

And yet, those who feel that the international component can be mounted "without a nickel" and those who feel that new money is essential are both right. In part, it is a matter of semantics; in part, it is a matter of accounting. Many funds on college campuses are "fungible" in nature; that is, they often cannot be separated or factored out in any useful way. Thus, what does it cost if a course on Global Issues is offered instead of one on Urban Sociology? Clearly a cost can be determined, if necessary, but since equal dollars were shifted from one area to another, does such accountability perform any useful function? What does it cost to teach American literature to two foreign students who are in a class of 27 taking the same course? A cost can be determined, but again no new money has been allocated, and if the two foreign students were not there, would anything be saved? If the costs are made up partly of tuition paid by students and partly in subsidy paid for by taxes, how much of each was used to provide for the two foreign students? If tax money was used, as was likely, how much? Again, accountants can probably determine such data, but it is difficult to assess its usefulness.

If there is truly a commitment to internationalizing the curriculum and the campus, there is no alternative than to begin even if it means starting without a single additional nickel. International is not so much a new program or activity as it is a new quality that should add depth, enrichment, and rigor to the academic program already on the campus. Just as good professors and good administrators are always in the process of evaluating their performance against many measures of achievement and accountability, the commitment to internationalize simply sets up another yardstick by which the quality of an institution can be measured. To the extent that any institution lacks an international dimension, its quality is diminished. When thought of in this way, the international elements–which mark an institution's determination that students who on graduation day the

president will "welcome to the company of educated women and men" are truly literate in global matters–need not require the expenditure of a single additional nickel.

However, once qualitative improvements have begun, and as the momentum builds to do more in the international arena, clearly some additional funds must be sought. Harari recognized that requiring additional funding is essential in providing that margin of excellence, quantitative as well as qualitative, which allows an institution to cultivate the international dimension among its campus community. Having developed 90 percent of its activities "without a nickel," the university must seek additional funds from grants, contracts, and, to a lesser extent, state funds. Having established a track record of self-help and demonstrated an abiding commitment to establishing the international dimension on campus, the participants agreed that a university would stand a better chance of getting funding.

Edmond Volpe, president of the College of Staten Island of the City University of New York, spoke in terms of proselytising "one professor at a time" as a means of identifying resources to begin internationalizing the curriculum and the campus. Earl Backman, of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, set forth a program by which funds may be obtained. He held that it was most important to seek funds for a particular project, and that that project be consistent with the character and the mission of the institution. To seek funding merely because funds may be available is unlikely to be successful or, if successful, is not likely to have any enduring effect on the campus. Institutions, he said, should try for grants in those areas in which they can make their best case, where they have a track record of some significance.

Backman warned that grant monies should be used for projects and not for those activities that one whishes to have on the campus permanently. "There are too many horror stories about large programs being developed, infrastructures built on soft money and the soft money dries up and then you have to start cutting bodies and cutting operations and doing things that become painful." In seeking grants, one should be sure that the grant makes sense from the point of view of the institution and that after the grant has been expended, there is a willingness to move the program to some hard-money status.

In obtaining grants, timing is very important. Institutions seeking funds need to know about available funding sources as early as possible. Waiting until a notice is placed in the *Federal Register* is probably too late, as there is not likely to be enough time to prepare an effective grant proposal. Well in advance of due dates, those interested in preparing grants should contact the granting agency, review the guidelines carefully, and perhaps

visit the AASCU Office of International Programs for additional help or direction.

Tanya Saunders-Hamilton of Florida International University (FIU) spoke about the need for networking in fund raising. Through the International Affairs Center at FIU, contacts were made with local business leaders and the philosophy and mission of the university were carefully explained to them. The International Affairs Center formed an advisory council of distinguished business men and women, professors, and community leaders–not only in local areas but from the country at large, and some from countries abroad as well. This council was asked to provide guidance, make recommendations and suggestions, and pave the way for the center staff to make those contacts necessary to raise such additional funds as may be needed. The University Foundation also established an International Committee made up of prominent Dade County citizens. These people not only "spread good tidings but provided financial assistance to the International Affairs Center as well." This network approach to international program development enabled Florida International University to maintain a policy of not soliciting funds abroad. This policy grew out of a wish to avoid the appearance of cultural or educational imperialism. "The International Affairs Center prefers to respond to formal requests for the university's services. The corollary of this policy is a decision not to compete with foreign academic institutions."

Among the more important funding guidelines, the following are worth noting since they were mentioned by representatives of several funding agencies and by other participants knowledgeable about obtaining funds for internationalizing the curriculum and the campus:

- There must be concrete evidence that the institution is committed to the international. First, make the commitment; then, the dollars may follow.
- Get information about grants well in advance of the submission date.
- Make sure the grant request is consistent with the institution's mission.
- Get help from the granting agency. It is often useful to make a telephone call or to visit the agency. It is also helpful to provide a two-or-three-page written summary of what is to be proposed in order to obtain further help from granting agencies.
- Make sure the grant request will lead, in due course, to permanent improvement on the campus.

The international dimension in U.S. colleges and universities may be likened to an iceberg. The tip of the iceberg, the visible portion, consists of international programs, foreign students in residence, international faculty exchanges, and an office of international programs. But this visible portion rests on a larger foundation that consists of state legislatures and boards that provide the funds and govern the institutions, corporations that help support colleges and universities, publishers whose materials influence what is actually taught in colleges and universities, and the informal network of programs and activities that take place in museums, libraries, service and alumni clubs, labor unions, and chambers of commerce. Unless these too develop the international perspective, colleges and universities will find it difficult and perhaps impossible to change the global social order.

If international is to become an important element in the academic preparation of students, then it is too late to begin in college. Elementary and secondary schools must also be involved in restructuring their courses of study so that students develop a global readiness. As the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education suggests, U.S. educators must reflect on the role of public education in a worldwide framework, reflecting the changing role of the United States in world affairs. The larger community must be made aware of and sensitive to the emerging world structure and must encourage institutions to recast their missions in global terms, lest their students, years later, raise the question of Robert Muller, undersecretary for the United Nations, ". . . why was I not warned? Why was I not better educated? Why did my teachers not tell me about these [global] problems?"

This workshop gave participants new perspectives of what remains to be done to internationalize the curriculum and the campus. While conference participants arrived aware of the nature of international education as it is; they left dreaming of international education as it could be and they asked, "Why not make it so?"

- Why not treat education as an exportable service and in a conscious way structure it so as to help the U.S.'s balance of payments?
- Why not establish precise measures by which institutions can determine what foreign students contribute to academic enrichment?
- Why not require that men and women preparing to teach in the nation's schools provide evidence of knowledge and awareness of global affairs before graduating from college and before obtaining certification?

- Why not require mastery of a foreign language as part of the undergraduate curriculum, provided that such mastery be determined on the basis of appropriate proficiency tests?
- Why not establish regional consortia for the teaching of the less commonly taught languages?
- Why not exert pressure on publishers to include more of an international dimension in their textbooks?
- Why not develop in-service programs for professors to help them incorporate global matters in their courses?
- Why not set up numerical "goals" representing the optimum number of foreign students that can be effectively integrated into the campus community?
- Why not give promotion, tenure, and salary credit for faculty at least partially on the basis of effective participation in helping to internationalize the curriculum and the campus?
- Why not provide travel funds for professors invited to teach or to do research at a school or college in another country?
- Why not accept student teaching and other internships abroad as acceptable experience in meeting teacher certification requirements?
- Why not restructure the college or university by finding alternatives to the departmental structure which is often an obstacle to internationalizing the curriculum and the campus?

We need to rethink the nature of international education. Perhaps one way to do so is to recognize that international education is not the number of foreign students on the campus. It is not the number of international faculty exchanges that can be developed. It is not area studies taken generally by relatively few students. International education in our colleges and universities must focus on the U.S. student, and the curriculum must emphasize the ability to think in global terms. On the nature of international education, Leland Miles had this to say: "What then is international education? I say the guts and heart of it is the curriculum because a university is, after all, an academic institution. When I say the curriculum . . . I mean an internationalized liberal arts core required of all students, and giving them a common international experience.[16] Miles went on to point out that, according to the Council on Learning, only 299 institutions out of 3200 "have even the rudiments of international education."[17] In view of these data and this definition, the campus must be internationalized because we both want and need students who are literate in Twenty-first Century terms, which cannot be other than global in nature.

That global literacy is not a matter for the United States alone was reflected in the comments of distinguished speakers from Malaysia, Egypt, and Nigeria, each of whom participated in the conference. Mohd Nasir Zain of Malaysia and Yehia Kabil of Egypt, as well as Modilim Achufusi of Nigeria, indicated that, in their attempts to provide their students with global literacy, they, too, have sought to restructure their curricula to provide opportunities for their students to study in other countries. They pointed to the international linkages in research that are developing between U.S. colleges and universities and those in their own countries, as well as linkages between their universities and U.S. industry. Each of these countries is making enormous efforts to improve the quality of education they can provide at home, but at the same time, they require opportunities for their students abroad. Mr. Zain, of Malaysia, pointed out the importance his country placed on education as a means of improving the quality of life led by all the races of his homeland. This makes for an enormous economic strain and to the extent that AASCU colleges and universities can help to provide some relief, he urged them to try to do so.

Despite the ambiguities that might exist in the minds of some as to exactly what international education is and the fact that different groups give more emphasis to some specific aspect of international education rather than to the whole, the consensus is overwhelming: U.S. students, indeed all U.S. citizens, must become more globally aware and interculturally sensitive. Our schools, colleges, and universities have the most critical role to play to achieve this objective. We may argue different strategies or how much it costs to do what on a campus but the imperative of internationalizing the curriculum and the campus is undeniable. While the utopian vision of a reconstituted global social order may not be achievable, expanding the international dimension clearly offers the best response to this challenge.

NOTES

[1]George S. Counts. *Dare the School Build a New Social Order.* New York: John Day, 1932.

[2]Leland Miles. "The Benign Conspiracy," *Vital Speeches.* Vol. XLVIII, No. 10, March 1, 1982, pp. 303-307.

[3]Kenneth Boulding. "The Emerging Super-Culture," in *Values and the Future.* Kurt Baier and Nicholas Rescher, eds. New York: The Free Press, 1969, p. 347 *passim.*

[4]Robert C. Wood. "The 21st Century is Now," *Educational Record,* No. 58, #1, Winter, 1977, pp. 8-30.

[5]Ibid.

[6]James A. Perkins. "Educating for a World View," *Change,* May/June, 1983, Volume 12, #4, p. 44.

[7]George W. Bonham. "Education and the World View," *Change.* Vol. 12, #4, May/June 1980, p. 2.

[8]Don Sikkink. *Internationalizing the Curriculum.* St. Cloud State University, May 28, 1982, p. 2.

[9]Maurice Harari. "Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus: Guidelines for AASCU Institutions." *AASCU Studies 1981/3 (*February, 1983, revised).

[10]Harlan Cleveland. "Forward to Basics," *Change.* Vol. 12, #4, May/June, p. 19.

[11]Ibid.

[12]*State Plan for Global Education in Florida. Findings and Recommendations* (Abridged Copy), Florida Advisory Council on Global Education. Approved by State Board of Education, February 2, 1982.

[13]National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, *Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.* Washington, D.C.: NCATE, 1977.

[14]Craufurd D. Goodwin and Michael Nacht. *Absence of Decision.* New York: Institute of International Education, 1983.

[15]"By the beginning of the 1980s, the annual census by the Institute of International Education indicated that there were 300,000 foreigners with student visas enrolled in colleges and universities in the United States (and this number may not reflect all the foreigners studying in this country) with the possibility that this number might exceed one million before the end of the century." Goodwin/Nacht. op. cit., p. iii.

[16]Leland Miles. loc. cit.

[17]Ibid.

APPENDIX A

Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus

Workshop Program
March 16–18, 1983

WEDNESDAY, March 16

Opening Luncheon

Conference Chair: Dr. James M. Clark, president, State University of New York College at Cortland and Chair of AASCU's Committee on International Programs.

Keynote Speaker: Dr. Sven Groennings, director, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, *"New Directions in International Education."*

Internationalizing the Undergraduate Curriculum

Panel:

Dr. Maurice Harari, vice president for International Programs, AASCU, *"Content and Process: An Overview."*

Dr. John Petersen, assistant vice president for Academic Affairs, Western Kentucky University, *"Internationalizing the General Education and Upper Division Curricula: Western Kentucky University, A Case Study."*

Dr. Don Sikkink, professor of Speech Communications, St. Cloud State University, *"Assessing the Status and Potential of an Institution: St. Cloud State University, A Case Study."*

Dr. Jan Tucker, professor of Social Studies Education, Florida International University, *"Reaching Out on a State Level: Florida International University, A Case Study."*

Dr. G. Robert Ross, president, Western Washington University, *"The Role of the Leadership in the Process of Institutional Change."*

Small Group Discussions

Moderators:

Dr. Seymour Fersh, coordinator, Curriculum Development and Special Projects, Brevard Community College.

Dr. William C. Olson, dean, School of International Service, American University.

Small Group Discussions continued

Dr. Sherry H. Penney, vice chancellor for Academic Programs, Planning and Policy, State University of New York System.

Participating Federal Resources:

Department of Education, International Studies Branch, Ms. Susanna Easton.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Dr. Sven Groennings.

National Endowment for the Humanities, Dr. Cynthia Wolloch.

United States Information Agency, Academic Programs Office, Dr. Ann Radwan.

THURSDAY, March 17

Internationalizing the Professional Schools

Chair: Dr. H. F. Robinson, chancellor, Western Carolina University.

Panel:

Dr. Charles Smallwood, dean of Agriculture and Home Economics, California State University, Fresno, *"Our International Responsibilities."*

Dr. Alan H. Wheeler, dean, School of Education, Radford University, *"What Every Good Professional Ought to Know."*

Dr. Robert Fleck, Jr., dean of Business Administration, Clarion State College, *"Funding the International Component."*

Dr. Walter Waetjen, president, Cleveland State University, *"Policy Issues in Internationalizing the Professional School."*

Participating Federal Resources:

Department of Education, International Education Programs, Dr. Ann Schneider.

National Science Foundation, Science in Developing Countries Program, Dr. Gordon Hiebert.

Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD), Human and Institutional Resources Division, Dr. C. Jean Weidemann.

BIFAD, Country Programs Division, Dr. John Shields.

USDA, Office of International Cooperation and Development, International Training Division, Dr. Frank Fender.

Small Group Discussions (select one):

1. *"Creating International Learning Opportunities for Students in Professional Schools."*
   Moderator: Dr. Alan Wheeler, dean of Education, Radford University.
2. *"Faculty Development for an International Professional School."*
   Moderator: Dr. Charles Smallwood, dean of agriculture and home economics, California State University, Fresno.
3. *"Business/Higher Education Cooperation for International Development."*
   Moderator: Dr. Bert Faulhaber, director, Institute of Transnational Business, Ball State University.

Resources for Small Group Discussions:
Dr. Robert Fleck, Jr.; Chancellor H. F. Robinson; and President Walter Waetjen

---

Integrating Educational Exchange with the Institutional Mission
Chair: Dr. E. K. Fretwell, Jr., chancellor, University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Panel 1: "Faculty Exchange–Purpose and Implications"
Dr. Charles E. Smith, chancellor, University of Tennessee at Martin, *"Institutional Policies and Practices and their Effects on Faculty Exchange."*

Dr. Barbara B. Burn, president, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and international programs director, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, *"Building an Effective Faculty Exchange Program which Supports the International Mission of the Institution."*

Dr. Earl O. Kline, director of international studies, The College of Charleston (SC), *"Faculty Exchanges: Professional Development and Impact on the Campus and Community."*

Panel 2: "Coping with the Growth of the Foreign Student Population"
Dr. E. K. Fretwell Jr., chancellor, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, *"Trends in Foreign Student Policy: Reactions to the Goodwin-Nacht Report."*

Mr. John F. Reichard, executive vice president, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, *"Response to the Issues: Formulating Foreign Student Policy."*

Dr. Josef Mestenhauser, professor and director, Office of the Advisor to Foreign Students, University of Minnesota, *"Maximizing the Contribution of Foreign Students in Internationalizing the Campus."*

Small Group Discussions (select one):

1. *"Guidelines for Developing Institutional Policy on Faculty Exchange."*
   Moderator: Dr. Edwin G. Speir, Jr., president, Georgia College.

2. *"Maximizing the Impact of Faculty Exchanges on Campus, Curriculum, and Community."*
   Moderator: Dr. Clyde J. Wingfield, president, State University of New York College at Old Westbury.

3. *"Questions and Issues in Setting Foreign Student Policy."*
   Moderator: Dr. Craig Dean Willis, president, Lock Haven State University

4. *"Involving Foreign Students in Internationalizing the Campus."*
   Moderator: Dr. Constance H. Carlson, president, University of Maine at Presque Isle.

Banquet

Theme: **"Trends and Issues in International Educational Cooperation"**

Chair: Dr. Louis J. Rodriguez, president, Midwestern State University and Vice-Chair of AASCU's Committee on International Programs.

Panel:

Dr. Yehia Kabil, director, Cultural and Educational Bureau, Embassy of Egypt, *"U.S.–Egyptian Relations."*

Mr. Mohd Nasir Zain, director, Malaysian Students Department, Embassy of Malaysia, *"U.S.–Malaysian Relations."*

Dr. Modilim Achufusi, director, Nigerian Universities Office, *"U.S.–Nigerian Relations."*

FRIDAY, March 18

Internationalizing the Campus–The Student Scholar Perspective

Chair: Dr. Thomas E. Bellavance, president, Salisbury State College.

Panel:

Dr. Anthony Mughan, lecturer in political science, University College, Cardiff Wales, and Fulbright Scholar, College of William and Mary.

Ms. Susana Carrillo (Peru), George Mason University.

Mr. Ngure Wa Mwachofi (Kenya), George Mason University.

Mr. Rusty DeCou (USA), George Mason University.

Mobilizing the Needed Resources

Chair: Dr. Edmond L. Volpe, president, The College of Staten Island

Panel:

Dr. Earl Backman, director, Center for International Studies, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, *"Pursuing Grants and Contracts to Support International Programs."*

Dr. Tanya Saunders-Hamilton, program coordinator, International Affairs Center, Florida International University, *"Generating and Administering International Development Activities."*

Dr. Preston J. Stegenga, director, International Center, California State University-Sacramento, *"Mobilizing Community Resources to Assist in the Internationalization of the Campus."*

Summaries and Recommendations of Discussion Groups

Closing Luncheon

Chair: Dr. James M. Clark, Conference Chair.

Speaker: Dr. Rose Hayden, executive director, National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, *"The Balance Sheet and Where Do We Go From Here?"*

AASCU Office of International Programs Staff:

Maurice Harari, Vice President for International Programs
Virginia Russell, Coordinator
Nilda Rendino, Senior Administrative Assistant
Ellen Lanahan, Workshop Coordinator
Gilbert Anderson, Senior Consultant

APPENDIX B
Contact Persons

Internationalizing the Undergraduate Curriculum

Panelists:

Dr. Maurice Harari, vice president for international programs, AASCU, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036*

Dr. John Petersen, assistant vice president for academic affairs, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY 42101

Dr. Don Sikkink, professor of speech communications, St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, MN 56301

Dr. Jan Tucker, professor of social studies education, School of Education, Florida International University, Tamiami Campus, Miami, FL 33199

G. Robert Ross, president, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA 98225

Moderators:

Dr. Seymour Fersh, coordinator, Curriculum Development and Special Projects, Brevard Community College-Cocoa Campus, 1519 Clearlake Road, Cocoa, FL 32922

Dr. William C. Olson, dean, School of International Service, American University, Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues, NW, Washington, DC 20016

Dr. Sherry H. Penney, vice chancellor for academic programs, planning and policy, State University of New York, Central Administration, SUNY Plaza, Albany, NY 12246

Federal Resource Persons:

Mrs. Susanna C. Easton, International Studies Branch, Room 3916, ROB No. 3, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202

Dr. Sven Groennings, director, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 7th and D Streets, SW, Washington, DC 20202

Dr. Cynthia Wolloch, program officer, Education Program, National Endowment for the Humanities, 806 15th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20506

Dr. Ann Radwan, United States Information Agency, E/AEN, 400 C Street, SW, Washington, DC 20547

*Dr. Harari is now Director, Center for International Programs, California State University, Long Beach, Long Beach, CA 90801

Internationalizing the Professional School

Panelists:

Dr. H.F. Robinson, chancellor, Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC 28723

Dr. Walter Waetjen, president, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH 44115

Dr. Robert Fleck, Jr., dean, School of Business Administration, Clarion State College, Clarion, PA 16214

Dr. Charles Smallwood, dean, School of Agriculture and Home Economics, California State University, Fresno, Fresno California 93740

Dr. Alan Wheeler, dean, School of Education, Radford University, Radford, VA 24141

Also Participating:

Dr. Bert Faulhaber, director, Institute of Transnational Business, College of Business, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306-1099

Federal Resource Persons:

Dr. Gordon Heibert, program director, Science in Developing Countries Program, International Programs Division, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC 20550

Dr. Ann Schneider, program specialist, International Educational Programs, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202

Dr. John Shields, program specialist, Country Programs Division, Board for International Food and Agricultural Development, U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC 20523

Dr. C. Jean Weidmann, director, Human and Institutional Resources Division, Board for International Food and Agricultural Development, U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC 20523

Dr. Robert Werge, program specialist, Course Development and Overseas Project Unit, Office of International Cooperation and Development, International Training Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC 20250

Integrating Educational Exchange with the Institutional Mission

Panelists:

Dr. Charles E. Smith, chancellor, University of Tennessee at Martin, Martin, TN 38238

Dr. Barbara B. Burn, director, International Programs, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01002

Dr. Earl O. Kline, professor of political science, College of Charleston, Charleston, SC 29407

Dr. E. K. Fretwell Jr., chancellor, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, UNCC Station, Charlotte, NC 28223

Mr. John F. Reichard, executive vice president, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1860 19th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009

Dr. Josef Mestenhauser, director, Office of Advisor to Foreign Students, University of Minnesota, 717 East River Road, Minneapolis, MN 55455

Moderators:

Dr. Edwin G. Speir, Jr., president, Georgia College, Milledgeville, GA 31061

Dr. Clyde J. Wingfield, president, State University College at Old Westbury, Box 210, Westbury, NY 11568

Dr. Craig Dean Willis, president, Lock Haven State College, Lock Haven, PA 17745

Dr. Constance H. Carlson, president, University of Maine at Presque Isle, Presque Isle, ME 04769

Mobilizing the Needed Resources

Panelists:

Dr. Edmond L. Volpe, president, The College of Staten Island, 130 Stuyvesant Place, Staten Island, NY 10301

Dr. Earl L. Backman, director, Center for International Studies, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, UNCC Station, Charlotte, NC 28223

Dr. Tanya R. Saunders-Hamilton, program coordinator, International Affairs, Florida International University, SW 107th Avenue and Tamiami Trail, Miami, FL 33199

Dr. Preston Stegenga, director, International Center, California State University-Sacramento, Sacramento, CA 95825

American Association of
State Colleges and Universities

One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/293-7070

Allan W. Ostar
President